



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

account not to man, but to God. If we are wrong, resort to lynch-law will not set us right, whilst it inflicts serious injury on the whole community.

"We desire to acknowledge with sincere thanks many expressions of support and sympathy from both strangers and friends. History often has to reverse the popular verdicts of the day, and we believe it will reverse the verdict of violence which has been given against us.

"William Rowntree, Joshua Rowntree, W. S. Rowntree, James H. Rowntree, Allan Rowntree, John Watson Rowntree, George Rowntree, William Smith."

Senator Hoar's Speech.

Senator Hoar's speech in the Senate on the 17th of April against the imperialistic policy on which the government has entered was a great speech in the truest sense of the word. It was great in eloquence, in frankness and in solemnity of utterance, in which it has rarely been surpassed in the annals of American oratory. But it was much greater in its grasp and exposition of fundamental political truth. We know of no speech in the whole range of American history which so goes down to the very roots of the ideas and principles out of which the nation and its institutions have grown, and so comprehensively and clearly sets forth their demands as binding for all time upon a nation which claims to be the leader among nations in the establishment and maintenance of human rights, human liberties and human progress.

Senator Hoar's estimate of Aguinaldo and of the capacity of the Filipinos to institute and develop government for themselves may be overdrawn. But their right to have the opportunity to try it, if American principles be true, he makes as clear as the noon-day sun. His speech voices the spirit and practice of our national and international policies up to the present time. It is unanswerably strong in that portion in which he shows that no previous acquisitions of territory have been made against the wishes of the inhabitants, where there were any, and that our whole previous policy in acquiring has been to create in time further territories and states as a part of the National Union. This has not only been so in theory but in practice, and the attempt now to extend our sovereignty over territories and peoples against their wishes, and with the declared intention to bar them out of the union, to withhold from them the Constitution, is to abandon the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the fathers and all our history. It is to start backward towards barbarism and tyranny.

The declaration that where the American flag has once been raised it shall never be hauled down, Mr. Hoar denounces as the "purest ruffianism and tyranny." It is to substitute "an empty drum for brains" and "a life for conscience." It is to "abandon the old language of freedom," to introduce the (to us) new language of dominion and tyranny.

It is impossible here to make any adequate analy-

sis of the grand passages in which the venerable senator reviews the history of the origin and responsibility of the Philippine war, exposes the hollowness of the commercial arguments put forward in favor of holding the Philippines, portrays the dangers and burdens of the militarism growing out of the new policy, deplores the abandonment by our country of "the right to speak with authority of peace," outlines the policy which ought to be pursued toward the Philippines, and unfolds the scroll of our national history and of the great deeds of the fathers and the leaders of previous generations.

Every honest young man in America having the welfare and honor of his country at heart, especially those of high purposes and generous impulses who have been for the moment confused by the catchwords and high-sounding phrases of imperialism, ought to read and reread Senator Hoar's utterances with perfectly candid mind. The sympathy with him in his position, even among men of his own party, is deep and widespread in the nation. Multitudes of letters and telegrams of congratulation and approval and requests for copies of the speech have poured in upon him. The reception thus accorded the speech is said to be unprecedented in the history of Congress. The speech ought to be circulated among the people by millions. If it were not for the bondage of party, there is every reason to believe that it would turn the tide, and that imperialism would soon be the badge of shame for every American professing it.

The only criticism we have to offer is that Mr. Hoar in this speech concedes the right of conquest, which only a year or so ago he had so strenuously denied. This is a very grave lapse, even though it may have come about only incidentally through the exigencies of his present argument, as we incline to believe. The criticism that he announces his intention of supporting his party, even though it goes on falsified and loaded down with the errors and sins which he so vigorously arraigns, is probably based upon an imperfect understanding of his real meaning. He does not seem to declare his purpose to vote with the party under these conditions, though he now looks with hope only to it for a change in the present trend of affairs. However he may interpret his duty as to party when the autumn arrives, one thing is perfectly sure: he has made it impossible for multitudes of staunch Republicans to vote again for the present administration unless the policy of imperialism is totally abandoned.

The criticisms of the speech offered by the imperialist press have been mostly of a general, vague, sentimental, dogmatic sort. He is a traitor to his party, to the country. He is declared to be behind the times. His speech is a great one, but it belongs to a bygone age. He is to be tolerated, perhaps pitied, as an old man clinging to the idols of the past. These

pitiful things are said in lieu of anything real to say. The fact is, no speech ever spoken in Congress is less an utterance of the past. It is, to be sure, an interpretation of our own past as a nation. But does not the future destiny of the world hang on the acceptance of the principles of right, justice, liberty, equality and self-government out of which the great Republic grew? If Senator Hoar's speech belongs to the past, then civilization has no future. It has passed its noon meridian, and night and final darkness are not far away.

If our country finally abandons the ideals portrayed by him, by which it has hitherto been led, it may for a time, through war and domination, grow greater in length and breadth, but in every other respect it will grow less. The corruptions of ambition and greed, with the dangerous and exhausting entanglements springing therefrom, will bring it finally to the dust, and thereafter it will never be able to rise again, if at all, without solemn repentance and a return to first principles. "Now is the day of salvation."

Annual Meeting.

The Annual Business Meeting of the American Peace Society will be held in Social Hall, Tremont Temple, Boston, on Wednesday, the 9th inst., at 2 o'clock P. M.; not Monday the 7th, as announced in our last issue. A full report of the proceedings, including the annual report of the Board of Directors, will be published in the June ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

Editorial Notes.

National Martyrdom.

At the meeting of the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, held at Sheffield, England, in March, Dr. Alexander Mackennal gave utterance to a great practical Christian truth, in regard to national life, which few Christian teachers have in modern times had the candor and courage to declare. We quote one passage:

"The hardest lesson we have to learn is that a nation which would fulfil the perfect law of Christ may have to give its life for its testimony. For many years the thought has pressed upon me that, if England is to fulfil her noblest destiny, she may be called to be a sacrificial nation. And I have had the dream that the sacrifice might be in the cause of peace. If England, in the plenitude of her power, should lay down every weapon of a carnal warfare, disband her armies, call her fleets from the sea, throw open her ports, and trust for her continued existence only to the service she could render to the world and the testimony she would bear to Christ, what would happen? I know not; and the doubt, the knowledge that any one who would speak of such a thing would not command a serious hearing has made me a lonely man. But it comes again and again; the longing will not be repressed. It might be that Christ, whose 'finished work' is the trust of his people, would

declare that the purpose of such a sacrifice is sacrifice; that the example would be enough, and that the nation would continue to be living and strong in the gratitude of all peoples. But if otherwise, what then? Such a martyrdom would quicken the conscience of the world. I am sure that, so long as the vision of a martyred nation appears absurd and impossible, there will never be a Christian nation. This also I believe, that, until our advocates of peace fairly apprehend that a nation martyred for Christ's sake may be within the counsel of God, their advocacy will lack its final inspiration and its victorious appeal."

Boy Butchers.

Concord, for April, continues its study of what the English army is and what it costs. In this fifth article, under the caption, "A Chapter of Boy Butchers," the following most remarkable, indeed startling, information is given:

"The essential fact in the evolution of the British army during the last twenty years is that it has become steadily more and more an army of lads. The number of recruits for the Regulars under seventeen years of age has greatly increased; the proportion remains stationary at nearly four per cent. The number under nineteen has almost quadrupled itself. The recruits in their eighteenth year were 17,362 in 1898, against 5,359 in 1879; those in their nineteenth year were 8,538, as compared with 4,913 twenty years earlier. The number under twenty years of age was 27,642, out of a total recruited number of 40,701. In 1879 the proportion was 11,339 out of 25,896. Thus the proportion of lads of sixteen, seventeen, eighteen and nineteen to the whole of those who join the colors has increased in this period of progressive imperialism from forty-three to sixty-eight per cent. . . .

"The whole growth of the army in these years is due to a large increase in boy enlistment. In 1898 only 193 recruits had reached their twenty-fifth year, as compared with 1,530 who were still in their sixteenth. . . .

"If we turn to the Militia—which is now, be it remembered, available for foreign service—we find the same fact in a more accentuated form. Of 40,127 recruits in 1898, just over 500 were only sixteen years old, 13,416 were only seventeen, 11,766 were only eighteen, and 4,997 were only nineteen; and those of more mature age were all told only 9,445 in number. Taking the whole Militia force as it stands, we find that it contains 782 boys of sixteen, 8,486 lads of seventeen, 13,441 of eighteen, and 12,876 of nineteen. . . .

"We peace men are often charged with vague and vain theorizing; but we have here a concrete and radical fact upon which one would think all decent men must agree, if only they knew about it. We have had to consider so many arguments in defence of armies and fighting that we are inclined to think no new variations can be invented. Many of these arguments afford matter for serious consideration, and some of them lead to genuine differences of ethical opinion; but we have never yet heard any attempt to justify the training of boys of sixteen to the business of manslaughter, or the drafting of boys of sixteen off into the military hells of India and Egypt. . . . The total proportion of desertion has de-